RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN, ORBISON & LEWIS

GREGORY W ALBERTY
REBECCAY AMERIT
REBECCAY AMERIT
JACK R ANDERSON
HAMAS IN ASSEW
LISAK BICKLE
LISAK BICKLE
LISAK BICKLE
LISAK BICKLE
LISAK BICKLE
JERR
GRILLAND
HOLLAND
HOLLAN

STEPHENE HALE
MELVENC HALE
MELVENC HALE
BURRONE HAMM
ZACHERY R HANGES
CHRISTOPHEN S HEROUS
JERRIL HEL
HOLLY M HILLERMAN
ERNOWN LONES
SARAHG SHEM
ECOTT P, KINTLY
KINISTOPHEN E KOEPSEL
TERRY D MORDELISM I
G DUAKE LEE
JOSEPH P, LENNART
TYLER O LEVINS I
HOLL MARY JAM BOTT
HOLL MARY JAM BOTT
HOLL MALLOW
JOHN BOSS MALOY
JOHN BOS

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW THE PARAGON BUILDING SUITE 101 5801 BROADWAY EXTENSION OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA 73118-7489 (405) 843-9909 Fax (405) 842-2913

September 7, 2007

CLOYD L MCCOY
RATHOND A MELDEN
RICHARDA A MELDEN
OUSARR MOHANEDBAN
J LYON MOREPEAD
JANCE LOGAN MORROW
ROBERT A I MANCE
GARY L HEAL
MARK MELLA
M

KEINETH M. SUITH
SCOTT D. SMITH
SCOTT D. SMITH
SETTY J. SOMMARS
BEVERLY A. STEWART
CHISTOPHER IS WANDON
STEPHANIE I. THEBAN
DAVID H. THOMAS
HARLEY W. THOMAS
HARLEY W. THOMAS
HARLEY W. THOMAS
HARLEY W. THOMAS
SONIA M. TREI
MICHAEL C. TURPEN
LINDA WAN ARREI-GREUBEL
MARDON N. WEAVER
JOSEPHAR WELLS
BINANS WILKERSON
DOUGLAS A WILSON
JERRY L. WITT
COURTNEY M. WOULD
MICHAEL P. WOLLACK
DARY W. WOULD
THACY S. ZANL

Of Counsel Benjamin P. Abney E. Bryan Henson Peter J. Regan

James Martin Graves, Esq VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL
Bassett Law Firm

Bassett Law Firm P.O. Box 3618 Fayetteville, AR 72702

Re: State of Oklahoma v. Tyson, et al. U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma Case No. 05-CV-00329-GKF-SAJ

Dear Mr Graves:

Theresa Hill has informed us that she has shared with you our letter of August 24, 2007 in which we proposed consolidated depositions of the State's 30(b)(6) witnesses in response to the five notices which the Cargill Defendants have served. Copies of these notices are attached hereto for your convenience.

Counsel for the Cargill Defendants have indicated their reluctance to consolidate their Rule 30(b)(6) depositions, based upon the assertion that they wish to ask questions specific to their clients. We have asked the Cargill Defendants to reconsider that position in light of the fact that, as evidenced by the responses to extensive and overlapping written discovery served upon the State, defense counsel, including counsel for the Cargill Defendants, understand full well that, for many of the areas of inquiry they propose, the answers will be the same or similar for all of the Defendants

We are now asking you directly if, on behalf of your clients, you are willing to organize a consolidated set of depositions of the State's 30(b)(6) witnesses on the general topic areas proposed by the Cargill Defendants. We pose this question without waiving any objections to the Rule 30(b)(6) notices which the Cargill Defendants have served upon the State, but in an effort to streamline discovery and minimize expense for the State and the Defendants as well.

Please advise if you are willing to proceed with discussions toward such a consolidated set of 30(b)(6) depositions.

Sincerely.

Robert A. Nance FOR THE FIRM

- Jance